# Memoirs, Diplomacy, and Implicit Consequences: Religion in U.S. Foreign Affairs

Research Thesis

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation

with Research Distinction in Religious Studies in the undergraduate colleges of

The Ohio State University

By

Jordan Baggs

The Ohio State University

April 2020

Project Advisor: Professor Isaac Weiner, Department of Comparative Studies

# Table of Contents

**Memoirs, Diplomacy, and Implicit Consequences: Religion in U.S. Foreign Affairs**

## Abstract

This senior thesis investigates how former Secretaries of State invoke religion in their memoirs in order to understand the implications of how religion is conceptualized and categorized in U.S. foreign service work. By focusing on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as a case study, I analyze how former secretaries represented the ways religion informed their policies and diplomatic efforts through their own religious upbringing, how they saw religion as a tool for engaging with the world, and whether or not they took religion seriously or superficially within memoir representations of their work. The thesis explores a twenty-year period from 1997-2017 by analyzing a memoir by each Madeline Albright, Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice, Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry. Drawing on secondary scholarship from political science and religious studies, especially the work of scholar Elizabeth Shakman Hurd, this thesis contributes to a broader understanding of how religion and international affairs intersect. By exploring how these secretaries chose to include or exclude religion within their retrospective memoir writings, I highlight some of the political, diplomatic, and personal implicit consequences of various ways of conceptualizing religion. In the end, I demonstrate the need for leaders within the international relations arena to take religion more seriously while also being mindful of the many dangers that can come with ignoring its complexity.

## Introduction

Towards the end of his tenure as Secretary of State, John Kerry wrote, "I often say that if I headed back to college today, I would major in comparative religions rather than political science. That is because religious actors and institutions are playing an influential role in every region of the world and on nearly every issue central to U.S. foreign policy ("We Ignore…")." As a college student myself, and especially as someone who started their college career solely majoring in international relations, Kerry's words inspired me. After my first year as an international relations major, I decided that my education would be incomplete without the addition of a religious studies specialization. Within many of my international relations and political science courses, religious influence was merely an afterthought or a few short paragraphs in a textbook chapter. I thought, surely religion plays a bigger role than my courses were implying. The separation of church and state in this country and others seemed to be much more complicated than one might think and I wanted to engage with that messy intersection. According to Kerry, religion influences world leaders and changemakers, it shapes social norms and cultural beliefs, and it can even justify violence ("We Ignore…"). As I embarked on my double-major journey, I found that Kerry's claims largely held true. International affairs and domestic politics are in fact interwoven with religious ideology, even in a country that would sometimes like to argue the contrary. Wanting to study this on a deeper level, I decided to take on this undergraduate senior thesis project.

As I considered where in the world religion might play the most important role in U.S.-led international affairs, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict came to mind. While Kerry's article doesn't specifically address the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, many diplomats and state officials frequently refer to this part of the world as the "holy land" without much consideration for the

consequences, either positive or negative, of that sort of language[1]. In this thesis, I set out to study the role of religion in U.S. affairs through the case study example of Israel and Palestine. To narrow the scope, I decided to focus on memoirs written by former U.S. Secretaries of State because memoirs can offer a unique insight into how key diplomatic actors imagine the forces that shape international affairs. By studying how religion is categorized and conceptualized within memoirs written by former Secretaries of State, especially concerning U.S. affairs in Israel and Palestine, I uncover trendlines about the role religion plays within these contexts. Religion is an important factor within international affairs that is often left implicit or taken for granted by those in power[2]. If world leaders want to solve conflicts and global issues through diplomatic and not military means, then leaders – such as Secretaries of State – need to have a more robust understanding of the real impact of their actions and background assumptions as they pertain to religious individuals, institutions, and governments in the wider world.

Even when religion is better understood and taken seriously within the international affairs arena, leadership must be cautious to not over simplify religion and its related issues. In *Beyond Religious Freedom: The New Global Politics of Religion*, political science and religious studies scholar Elizabeth Shakman Hurd critically analyzes how religious freedom initiatives within international affairs codify and define religion in ways that aid the strategic interests of those in power – sometimes to the detriment of those who are affected by their policies. In an effort to make her argument more comprehensible, Hurd breaks the "religion" heuristic into flexible categories: "expert religion," "lived religion," and "governed religion" (Hurd 8-10).

---

[1] I came to this conclusion informed by an academic article by Daniel Hummel which explores an argument specifically about religion and diplomacy within U.S. affairs in Israel and Palestine (Hummel). I also studied abroad in Jerusalem, Israel myself in July of 2019. While a long anecdote about my travels would only be tangentially relevant, what I learned in my coursework while abroad was certainly a part of my development of this thesis (Gelbwaser).

[2] This claim is rooted both in Elizabeth Shakman Hurd's work as well as in Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson's book titled, *Religion: The Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. This book was published in 1995 and is a bit outdated now, however their work likely informed political opinion over the 20-year period at the center of this thesis. (Johnston & Sampson)

Expert religion comes from those who produce "policy-relevant" information, primarily scholars and other expert analysts. Lived religion is what happens on-the-ground and within real peoples' everyday lives. For individuals, religion is a process of navigating the world through exploring and practicing various rituals and customs that may or may not fit within the expert and governed "official" definitions and categories. Governed religion comes from those in power including states, their legal systems, and also a growing number of international authorities and organizations. She claims those in power, both experts and government officials, have a tendency to lump religions into either the good, peace-loving, moderate faiths, or the bad, terror-fueled, extremist faiths – especially since September 11th 2001[3] (Hurd 16).

Hurd labels this tendency within the expert and governed realms as the "two faces of faith" model; "[Bad religion] is understood to be divisive and associated with the failure of the state to properly domesticate it – or, in some cases, of religion to properly domesticate itself." (Hurd 23). On the other side, "[Good] religion has come to be seen as relevant to international affairs as a means of promoting common international goods. … Good religion has work to do." (Hurd 24). Religions and sects that get sanctioned and validated by experts can become governed subjects of international advocacy and intervention while traditions, leaders, or communities that fail to fit the state's ideal model can become vilified or simply ignored. She describes a rekindling of interest in religion within the international relations field, especially within the United States, because religion was identified as a tool for furthering American interests abroad. This was not because people necessarily recognized or cared about the value that religion can have in an individual's life (Hurd 53). Utilizing her flexible religious heuristics here, expert

[3] Hurd isn't the only theorist who marks September 11th 2001 as a tipping point for the conceptualization of religion to exist within a dichotomized model. Within this much larger body of work, theorist William Cavanaugh also writes at length about this in his book *The Myth of Religious Violence*. He sees "religious" violence, like 9/11, as something that is inherently misunderstood due to the shortcomings of scholarship and expert understandings of religion itself. (Cavanaugh)

religion, and subsequently governed religion, oftentimes failed to recognize the complexity of religion as lived and practiced within actual individuals' lives.

As religion was taken more seriously within international relations, laws like The International Religious Freedom Act, passed in 1998 (United States Congress), meant that the U.S. State Department and U.S. Military were suddenly tasked with identifying and defining religion abroad in ways that would have never been permitted domestically due to the First Amendment. The IRFA mandated that reports on international religious freedom became annual occurrences and built in religious freedom educational requirements for diplomats and state officials. Additionally, the IRFA bolstered the State Department's collaborative capabilities with inter-religious networks and organizations as a means for peace-building and international cooperation. ("International Religious Freedom Act") This favored interreligious dialogue, religious-based humanitarian aid, and faith-based conflict resolution in ways that potentially excluded non-religious identities or other forms of coexistence (Hurd 62). The conceptualization of religion undertaken by this act assumes that all faiths operate in similar ways and that all people can be united through their faiths even if the tenets aren't exactly the same. Hurd claims this assumption is naïve at best and stems from that same lived religion blind-spot which plagues expert and governed religion inherently. With this recognition of how international religious freedom operates, Hurd calls for a change in the structures of scholarly theories of religion and also shifts in the legal integration of religious issues (Hurd 63). She claims that making room for the inherent "messiness" of religion within these frameworks is the only way forward and that a broad range of considerations must be given to history, culture, and economic realities when religion is part of the situation (Hurd 120-127).

Through analyzing these memoirs, I am interested in finding to what extent Secretaries of State emphasize or ignore the importance of religion. John Kerry claims that religion needs to be taken more seriously within the State Department and within international affairs more broadly. Hurd, however, argues that when religion is taken "seriously," focused attention on religion alone may cause falls into various trappings of not fully understanding the wider contexts. Additionally, while Hurd is analyzing policy and international affairs on a macro scale through individual case study examples, she doesn't analyze specific leaders on the same level that this thesis aims to incorporate. Despite this, her theory is still readily applicable to the work of this thesis. By approaching these memoirs through the lens of both Kerry and Hurd, I expected to find more of the problems that Hurd had described while also keeping in mind Kerry's call for more incorporation of religion into international affairs. However, I actually found that while there were some of the pitfalls outlined by Hurd, more often than not, Kerry's analysis was more readily applicable. Within these memoirs, religion was often dealt with in superficial ways that didn't take religion seriously in the first place. As I detail instances of where religion was or was not incorporated into these memoirs, themes oftentimes based in this superficiality regarding religious upbringing, religion as a pragmatic tool, and religion as a complicating factor within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict come to the forefront.

**What Can Memoirs Reveal About History?**

Analyzing former Secretary of States' memoirs as a source for measuring religious influence on U.S. foreign affairs may seem like an odd or interesting choice. However, political memoirs serve very intentional purposes which make them highly appropriate source material for this sort of project. In "Politics and Autobiography: Political Memoir as Polygenre," George

Egerton summarizes findings from the collaborative Political Memoirs Project conducted by a group of literary scholars (Egerton 221). In this research, Egerton and others found that even in the earliest examples of human civilization, leaders have longed to leave their mark on the world. Memoirs are simply a natural extension of that basic drive. Egerton notes in his summary, "The dynamics which generate memoir in any culture include willful leadership, dramatic events, and a potential readership among contemporaries or posterity, eager for personalized narration of history (Egerton 224)." However, unlike other genres of historical literature, political memoirs shouldn't be considered historically accurate down to the last detail[4], but should instead be viewed through the intentions of who wrote it and what they wanted to achieve through their work (Egerton 233). Therefore, political memoirs are better understood as a "polygenre" due to the fact that they cover many different genres of writing including but not limited to memoir, history, political science, journalism, and storytelling (Egerton 223-24).

Due to the potential historical inaccuracies associated with memoir writing, or perhaps what would be better understood as their non-historical focus, this project will not be detailing a 20-year history of U.S. foreign affairs or U.S. involvement in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict – that is much beyond the scope of this thesis[5]. While historical events do become relevant as the former secretaries write about their experiences, detailing the larger international contexts would mean the individual focus on how religion is operating within these memoirs would be lost. That said, understanding that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is a longstanding, multifaceted, and very complicated issue is central to this project as I will be utilizing the Secretaries' remarks on this

[4] Arguably, no form of history should be considered a completely faultless work. Biases, intentions, and assumptions must always be assessed in these ways but Egerton is arguing that political memoir especially must be analyzed through these lenses.
[5] Even a synopsis of every aspect of religion at play within U.S. affairs in Israel and Palestine would be too much work for this particular thesis. For a more through work on this topic, Daniel Hummel wrote a piece titled: "Foreign Policy and Religion: U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Israel" which involves a much deeper analysis outside the work of Secretaries of State themselves. I read his work as a reference point for this thesis but oftentimes he was citing Presidents and policy in ways that didn't necessarily apply to memoir (Hummel).

conflict as a quasi-case study. The conflict deals with a wide variety of issues including personal rights to land, rights to vote, religious justifications, and historical precedence. The conflict has been fought both diplomatically and, more often than not, over the course of several wars. Israel was established as a state and recognized by the United States in 1948 ("Creation of Israel"), but the conflict didn't truly begin there. Depending on who is asked and how the question is framed, the nuances of this conflict are often found in the eye of the beholder. Many paths to peace and negotiations have tried and largely failed to change the conflict. The United States has often been at the center of these rarely sustainable projects attempting to establish peace. As Hurd recognized in her work, political conflicts are complex and religion is often just one factor among many (Hurd 118-119). Just as ignoring religion can be problematic, over-emphasizing the significance of religion can also cause problems if doing so disentangles religion from other political, economic, and social considerations.

Highlighting some important historical changes over the last 20 years would be remiss without noting that some of the biggest changes in U.S. diplomacy were shaped by the tragedy of the terrorist attacks on September 11th 2001. As Hurd noted in her work, religion became ever more present in political discussion and within the public sphere due to the misplaced but widely believed association of terrorism with Islam (Hurd 23). Highlighting important historical moments specifically within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict would be incomplete without recognizing one of the greatest attempts at reconciliation, the Oslo Accords, which happened around the same time as 9/11. Rekindled and renegotiated many times, the most iconic moment to come out of these accords was negotiated by former President Bill Clinton, leaders of Israel, leaders of Palestine, and former Secretary of State Madeline Albright. The Oslo Accords were

signed in 1993[6] and 1995, eventually culminating in a summit held at Camp David[7] in 2000 ("The Oslo Accords"). Due to both the relevance of 9/11 on the international scale and the importance of the Oslo Accords on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, focusing my scope little before the year 2000 and working towards today should prove to be rich with material for this thesis. Given this scope, analyzing a memoir from each Madeline Albright, Colin Powell, Condoleezza Rice, Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry will help to establish trend lines over the last 20 or so years.

Within some of the memoirs central to this project, it is important to recognize that driving motivations behind a political memoir could be influenced by the desire to run for office in a future campaign. As Egerton writes, things such as "reductionism, bias, the creation of a persona, special pleading, and outright dishonesty in promoting or defending personal interests (Egerton 233-34)" may be present within these types of works and memoirs must be approached with careful considerations because of that. However, political memoirs' personal nature is what in turn makes them such a unique and important object of study, "The personal linkage between the author and the past in memoir transforms the description of events, behavior, and circumstances into the narration of personal experience (Egerton 235)." According to Sidonie Smith, a scholar who published work on one of Hillary Clinton's other political memoirs not included in this thesis, *Living History*[8], "The "narrating 'I' functions as the 'voice' of the politician seeking to capture the attention of the reader … In its address to the imagined interlocutor, the narrating 'I' promises to draw the reader into the zone of familiarity,

[6] The famous handshake between Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Palestine Liberation Organization Negotiator Mahmoud Abbas was photographed during the 1993 signing of The Oslo I Accord ("The Oslo Accords").
[7] This location was chosen in honor of the earlier Camp David Accords, negotiated under President Carter's administration, that had some moderate amounts of success themselves ("The Oslo Accords").
[8] This memoir was not within the scope of the project because *Hard Choices* focused much more on Clinton's time as Secretary of State. Memoirs were chosen for their applicability to the subject matter if a Secretary had written more than one, like in the case of Hillary Clinton here and Madeline Albright further along in the thesis.

identification, and affective attachment, thereby overcoming … the sense of remoteness (Smith).” Memoirs thus function as something deeply personal despite the complex relationship surrounding the creation of memoir in the political world. Additionally, bringing a religious studies style analysis to this type of personal narrative proves more insightful than attempting to do the same work on heavily scripted speeches, policy, or press releases written during the time period of study due to the very nature of diplomacy and how careful leaders must be during times of conflict[9]. Reflection and retrospection are powerful tools for former government officials to unpack what was actually going on from their perspective (Smith). These types of memoirs are valid objects of study so long as considerations are given to the potential biases and outside factors at stake in the work.

An additional factor that must be acknowledged in the analysis of political memoir is that these memoirs are an inherently “corporate project,” in which former Secretaries of State – seeking to run for office or not – may employ ghostwriters and/or editors who refine the content and polish it to serve personal intent and marketability (Smith). In that pursuit of marketability, Smith writes[10], “In this it reproduces a highly intelligible mode of political memoir in which ‘individualistic narrators use linearity and realism to recount their lives, the seemingly authoritative mode with which to make the self cohere, produce verisimilitude, and construct the historical record’. This generic mode is the mode of the traditional bildungsroman whose history extends back to the late eighteenth century (Smith).” Within each of the memoirs in this project there exists a certain element of bildungsroman. Each of these Secretaries harkens back to childhood, often in a coming-of-age type way, to help shape who they are today and justify what

[9] The nature of diplomacy that I am referring to here is tied up in the practical application of statecraft, poise, and compromise. Speeches and statements given “in-the-moment” are working to weigh a large number of political objectives (National Geographic Society), while memoirs can have different goals through retrospection.
[10] Smith is also citing feminist scholar Margaret Henderson in this portion of the article (Henderson).

actions they may have taken along the way. More often than not, that bildungsroman incorporates a heavy amount of religion. Cynically, it could be said that the incorporation of religion in these portions of the texts seeks to appeal to a specific audience with an eye towards marketing, however, I think the connections run far deeper than mere corporate ideology. While ghostwriting, copyediting, and story-crafting is not uncommon, it doesn't take away from the valuable insights gained by how these particular Secretaries of State conceptualized (in retrospect) the role of religion in their diplomatic work.

**Defining Religion for Specific Contexts**

The bulk of this project began with an in-depth read of each of the five memoirs I selected as containing the most relevant material. In these reads, I searched for how and when each Secretary was invoking "religion." As I untangled their work and thought more about the goals of this project, I determined that seeking to highlight and understand the role religion plays within international affairs, meant that I also needed to establish a baseline of what exactly was counting as "religious" within these works. In addition to Hurd's religious heuristic breakdown, *The Second Edition of The Encyclopedia of Religion* provided a theoretical structure in shaping what should or should not count as something that appeared "religious." In his entry "Religion [First Edition]," Winston King writes that, "The very attempt to define *religion*, to find some distinctive or possibly unique essence or set of qualities that distinguish the 'religious' from the remainder of human life, is primarily a Western concern. … It is the product of the dominant Western religious mode … and is formative of the dichotomous Western view of religion. (King 7692)" Coming from a "Western" perspective and point of view myself, I kept in mind these considerations as I worked through my project. I also found that the structures behind what

Secretaries of State themselves ultimately labeled as religious fit into this Westernized model. This also aligned closely with Hurd's work and her assessment of how expert religion influences and shapes governed religion (Hurd 8).

In assessing these memoirs, it is important to recognize that each of these former Secretaries of State come from Western, American, and primarily Christian backgrounds[11]. Identifying and understanding how they see the role of religion within their own lives on a lived religious level certainly informs how they saw religion operating within the rest of the world. As I untangle each of their memoirs, it will become clear how their own backgrounds shaped these understandings. From a theoretical stance, Hurd also wrestled with the complexities that scholarly definitions of religion have since imposed on the governed and public understandings in the world (Hurd 62). In his entry titled "Religion [Further Considerations]," Gregory Alles is explicit in prescribing "religion" as a category belonging almost entirely to scholarship and lacking in a universal definition (Alles 7703). While this is hotly debated by scholars of religion, he argues that "religion" was originally created as a concept to make sense of the world, but has since become something that is set apart from the rest of social, historical, and political constructs. Hurd also highlighted some of these issues and I found this information important to keep in mind as I began to navigate the complexities of my thesis.

For Hurd, the idea that religion is "special" is part of the problem (Hurd 120). When it becomes an untouchable category analyzed apart from the social, historical, and political realms, there are greater consequences at stake for international policy. On the topic of the troubles associated with religious definition, the encyclopedia provided this assessment; "…there cannot be a universal definition of religion, not only because its constituent elements and relationships

[11] To note: Madeline Albright has familial and ancestral ties to Judaism as well. However, she was raised Roman Catholic and didn't discover this part of her identity until much later in life (Albright 6). More on this in the Albright section of this thesis.

are historically specific, but because that definition is itself the historical product of discursive processes. What is required is for scholars to determine what they mean by religion on a case-by-case basis. (Alles 7706)[12]" So in lieu of becoming bogged down by the semantics of defining religion as a whole, this project will only analyze "religious" references that the Secretaries themselves labeled as religious or which fit into categories otherwise recognized as mainstream "religions": Christianity, Judaism, Islam, etc. While I recognize that there is danger in excluding certain practices that may fall outside these categories, these memoirs themselves are already exclusive. Secretaries are often not explicit in what they mean when they call something "religious" or when they stand for protecting "religious" freedom themselves because they approach the topic with the same implicit understandings available to the public and to their readership. I don't necessarily think that this is a bad thing, but these implicit consequences are in fact at the heart of this project. For the sake of making sense of their positions, I won't be untangling figurative invocations of religion or religious texts nor will I be offering a single definition of religion of my own. This thesis is far more focused on explicit invocations of the category of religion and of specific religious traditions in these works in order to grasp at the implicit consequences of such inclusions.

For this project, I found "religion" within each and every one of these memoirs. As previously noted, I was looking for specific mentions of a mainstream faith, explicit religious values that these secretaries labeled as such in their reflections, and, in affairs within Israel and Palestine especially, reference to "holy" land or cooperation with religious or spiritual leaders and organizations. It is important to note that my approach to this subject will undoubtedly leave some things out – and that's okay. Religion is complicated, interwoven with all aspects of social

[12] Alles is citing scholar Talal Asad's *Genealogy of Religion* in this assessment (Asad 29).

life, and messy as a category. For the sake of this project, keeping my conceptualization limited will only help to clarify analyses about the role religion can play in U.S. foreign affairs through the lens of former Secretaries of State's memoirs. Ultimately, I discovered that religion was present when the former Secretaries were building narratives of their upbringing, religion was oftentimes seen as a tool for furthering person-to-person diplomacy, and within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, religion was seen as a complicating factor for an already complex situation. As I untangle each of these memoirs and explore where and when religion was invoked, it is my hope that these themes will come to the forefront.

## Memoir Analysis and Interpretation

### *Madeleine Albright*

Madeleine Albright served as the first female Secretary of State from 1997 to 2001 under President Clinton. Prior to her time in the State Department, she served as the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. and also had a long career in non-profit work and various campaign managing positions in Washington D.C. (Encyclopedia Britannica). While she was Secretary of State, she worked on the war and unrest in the Yugoslavia region, denuclearization with North Korea, and growing conflict in the Middle-East. In *The Mighty and the Almighty: Reflections on America, God, and World Affairs*, published five years after the end of her time in office, Albright points out instances during her term where she saw religion and diplomacy operating as inherently interwoven and connected[13]. Inspired and influenced by President Bush's proclamation that

[13] In addition to this memoir, Albright also wrote *Madam Secretary*, published in 2003, which detailed more in-depth accounts of her time in office but didn't focus as strongly on religion specifically. For the purposes of this project, *The Mighty and the Almighty* provided more than enough material and evidence for religious influence on U.S. foreign affairs, especially within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

America had a special mission from God to bring liberty and democracy to the world after the tragedy of 9/11, Albright wrestles with big questions about the influence of Christianity on U.S. foreign affairs and the prevalence of violent religious extremists shaping what she saw as a new and troubling future in this memoir. Albright combines her personal religious views and beliefs, her vast experiences interacting with a diverse group of world leaders and their religious backgrounds, as well as an in-depth look on how religion affects the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to outline what she sees as an overarching view on the role religion ought to play within U.S. foreign diplomacy.

### *Inherited Religious Beliefs*

Albright includes her own religious upbringing as an important influence on her life as she builds backstory on her own life. This element operates as a sort of scattered "bildungsroman" throughout her writing[14]. Albright was raised Roman Catholic and she attributes many of her moral values to that upbringing. Later in life, however, she learned of her Jewish heritage which influenced how she saw her own identity[15]. On this subject of religious upbringing Albright writes, "The groups to which we belong are part of our inheritance and culture – a consequence of where we were born and how we were raised. … If, as a child, I had been sent to temple instead of to church, I would have grown to adulthood with a different group identity (Albright 285)." Recognizing that religion is a powerful force in shaping one's life, Albright acknowledges throughout this memoir that her opinions, experiences, and views are inextricably linked to her own religious identity and upbringing. She sees religion as a powerful

[14] "Bildungsroman" as a concept relates to Sidonie Smith's work on political memoir (Smith) and literary studies more broadly.
[15] While this specific memoir has more than enough discussion on her religious identity, a more in-depth analysis on the discovery of her Jewish heritage is contained within her other book, *Madam Secretary* (Albright, 6).

force which operates outside her own life as well and a majority of her memoir centralizes on how religion was being approached while she was in serving as Secretary of State.

### *The International Religious Freedom Act*

While in office as Secretary of State, a major change occurred in how the U.S. government approached religion and religious freedom. The International Religious Freedom Act, passed in 1998, was a major result of religion being taken more seriously within international governments. Both Albright and Hurd acknowledge the importance of this act on the integration of religion into diplomacy in new and interesting ways. As I covered briefly in the introduction section of this project, the IRFA required an annual report to be produced, by the State Department, on religious freedom success and struggles. It also meant that the State Department would be in charge of defining what counted as "religious" for that report. Albright wrote that, "This landmark law has made identifying and condemning all forms of religious persecution an integral part of U.S. foreign policy and has caused American diplomats to become more comfortable and practiced at raising the issue." (Albright 96). Hurd echoes this point and notes that ultimately, this meant the U.S. State Department was suddenly tasked with identifying and defining religion abroad within the contexts of wider international affairs in order to know how to best help religious freedom flourish (Hurd 67). However, unlike Albright, Hurd doesn't see this act through the same optimistic lens perhaps due to the additional decade's worth of time and historical changes that occurred between the release of their two books. An additional point to note, while the International Religious Freedom Act may seem like something that could be used within the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, there has never been a case such as this within the State Department. As evidenced by Albright's memoir, the passing of this Act did

spark new conversations about the role religion and "religious literacy" should be playing within U.S. foreign affairs.

### *Islam 101*

The IRFA brought many new insights to how religion "should" be incorporated into diplomatic affairs. After the passing of the IRFA, Albright realized that the State Department was religiously "illiterate" and lacked a general understanding of Islam. She and her team came up with an "Introductory Guide to Islam" which was made available to officials traveling to Muslim-majority countries (Albright 112-115). She wrote, "Throughout the 1990s, foreign policy journals featured articles about 'Islamic extremists.' In meeting after meeting I found myself scrawling on a notepad, 'Learn more about Islam' (Albright 110)." After then learning more about Islam and helping to build this guide, Albright recognized that the information included was merely a basic overview and that it was largely historically-isolated, however she saw this kind of guide as a start to building religious understanding into diplomacy. A large part of Hurd's critique on this style of religious incorporation was that this type of "Islam 101" pamphlet was merely a quick fix for the lack of education and that the whole of a religion and its history cannot possibly be summarized in fifteen bullet points.

Just as Hurd and other theorists have pointed to the terrorist attacks on 9/11 as a pivotal moment for how religion would come to be viewed in the U.S., Albright recognized this as well. Albright noted that Islam was especially affected (Albright 232). While she wasn't in office on 9/11, because her term had ended in January of that same year, she still chose to incorporate her analysis of it into this memoir. In reference to this shift in thinking she wrote, "It is easy to blame religion – or more fairly, what some people do in the name of religion – for all our troubles, but that is too simple. Religion is a powerful force, but its impact depends entirely on what it inspires

people to do. The challenge for policymakers is to harness the unifying potential of faith, while containing its capacity to divide (Albright 66).” Throughout her memoir, she works diligently to explain how terrorism shouldn’t be used to vilify Islam as a whole, despite its media affiliations and the common misconceptions within the public sphere. While she does note other instances of religious violence outside of the Muslim world, she sees Islamophobia as the most pressing issue affecting the world during the time in which she wrote her memoir. As an immigrant herself, she sympathized with Muslim immigrants in “the West” who struggle to strike a balance between maintaining ethnic identity and assimilating into their local environments. She sees terrorism as fueled by the kinds of Islamophobia that further those divides and alienate young people who are still forming their religious, social, and cultural identities (Albright 242). Much of her book is devoted to this discussion, but she also links this analysis to turmoil and unrest in the Middle-East as a whole.

### *Divine Rights to Land*

Due to the historical importance, political pressure, and diplomatic urgency during her term, Albright wrote extensively about religion’s role within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and Middle-Eastern affairs more broadly. Contained mostly within a chapter titled “Holy Land, but Whose?”, Albright described how land in this part of the world is coveted by many different religious factions and outlines the large implications and consequences of that reality which is strongly felt when navigating it diplomatically (Albright 123-144). She notes that while typical land disputes could be solved using tried and true methods, disputes over “holy” land quickly devolved into existential arguments and theological debates. On this she writes, “Ordinarily, when diplomats sit down to negotiate a border, they come equipped with maps, and with suggestions for compromise. …Israelis and Palestinians care as deeply as anyone about

economic and security issues. … Productive conversation stops, however, when the parties argue for the rightness of their positions not on the basis of human laws and precedents, but on the basis of the promises and intentions of God (Albright 129).” While she was careful to not completely vilify religion as a limiting factor to peace, she definitely would point to religion’s power to influence people’s lives and the implications that has on certain peace processes. Perhaps this is precisely the problem that can arise when religion becomes too intertwined with politics. For Hurd, this would likely be labeled as a consequence of “governed” religion as it relates to the “bad” face of faith (Hurd 24). In the case of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, there were many complicating factors at play and religion was just one large part of the equation that Albright saw as sometimes overlooked or less likely to be considered.

### *Religion’s Role in Foreign Affairs*

Albright’s views on the role religion plays within U.S. foreign affairs are very similar to what John Kerry wrote a little over ten years later. Just as Kerry calls for the need to recognize religion as a vital influence on international affairs (“We Ignore…”), Albright writes, “I am often asked, ‘Why can’t we just keep religion out of foreign policy?’ My answer is that we can’t and we shouldn’t. Religion is a large part of what motivates people and shapes their views of justice and right behavior. It must be taken into account. Nor can we expect our leaders to make decisions in isolation from their religious beliefs… We must live with our beliefs and also with our differences; it does no good to deny them (Albright 285).” While it might seem easy to just cut religion out of foreign affairs and out of politics completely, Albright recognizes that there is more to it than that. People’s lives sometimes revolve around their religious beliefs and to deny their existence would be to blindly assess how the world works. However, religious beliefs can’t

be the driving force behind foreign policy decisions because not everyone holds the same values or believes in the same god(s), and some people aren't particularly religious at all.

Albright wrote this memoir largely in response to President Bush's claims that America had a special appointed job from God to spread democracy and justice (Albright 2). Albright doesn't refute the point about spreading democracy and establishing a more just world, however she does take an issue with the overt inclusion of religion in what would soon be the Iraq War. Albright's assessment of the role religion ought to play within U.S. affairs offers an optimistic but perhaps naïve outlook on the future of religious integration with diplomacy. As I have previously noted, Albright's assessment of the IRFA is far more optimistic than Hurd's understanding of this same act. At the time that it was passed, and also at the time that Albright wrote this memoir, there was only a superficial understanding of how the Act might impact religious communities and the overall conceptualization of religion within the international affairs arena. Hurd has a much more nuanced take on this idea because a lot more time had passed when she wrote her theory. Despite this, Albright seems to be engaging with religion and the idea that it might have some place within the diplomatic field in ways that were very sophisticated for the time. Religion is definitely a controversial subject within diplomacy and, while some of Albright's ideas in this memoir seem ahead of their time, she is making these assessments retrospectively. Albright sees the need for more integration of a religious studies perspective within the State Department and within international affairs more broadly along the same vein that Kerry will later highlight.

***Colin Powell***

Published in 2012, seven years after the end of his term as Secretary of State, *It Worked for Me* by Colin Powell details his accounts on life and leadership. Unlike the other memoirs in this research project, Powell's book read more as a "how-to" guide for future leaders regardless of profession. He relied on many stories and anecdotes from his time in the Army, his time as the National Security Advisor, and also his time as Secretary of State. Powell was the first African-American to hold the Secretary of State position and he served from 2001 to 2005 under President Bush. For the purposes of this research project, Powell's memoir was not nearly as rich with religious references, nor detailed accounts of what life was actually like as a Secretary of State, nor any reference to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict at all. These differences between Powell's memoir and other former Secretaries of State's memoirs in this project can be attributed to the themed nature of his memoir centralizing on the values of a good leader, the amount of time that had elapsed since his term as Secretary of State, and the fact that he was often at odds with the Bush administration during his term regarding how to best enact international diplomacy at a time of war (Powell 36). Additionally, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict largely took a backseat to turmoil elsewhere in the Middle-East at this time, namely the Iraq War. However, despite these differences and the lack of direct commentary on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Powell still alluded to the role religion played in his life and briefly outlined the role religion played on an international level within the context of war.

*Moral Lessons from Church*

Chapters within Powell's memoir often centralized on a particular aspect of leadership which he then related to a collection of anecdotes throughout his life. In a chapter titled "Kindness Works" (Powell 45-48), Powell wrote about a time that kindness was relevant in his

church life and how he later applied the lessons he learned in church to his leadership style. The story reads, “Many years ago, I was the warden – the senior lay person – of a small suburban Episcopal church in northern Virginia. During that time our bishop assigned to our parish an elderly priest…who was in some kind of personal distress and needed a parish home. … We welcomed him into the church family… At the very end of the sermon [on his last Sunday], the priest …quietly concluded, ‘Always show more kindness than seems necessary, because the person receiving it needs it more than you will ever know.’ He was talking about himself, of course (Powell 45).” Powell then went on to detail other instances in his life when kindness “worked” to show how important it was as a virtue for leaders. While not all of the chapters referenced Powell’s religious or spiritual life directly, it is probable that – like this example – many of his values were shaped from time spent in a church community.

### *Consequences of War*

In a section outlining the importance of strategy within the contexts of war, corporate operations, and diplomatic decisions, Powell notes that leaders must have a firm understanding of potential consequences and outcomes, regardless of the situation. In his justification for taking this stance, especially in the context of critiquing the Iraq and Afghanistan invasions, he references a quote from the Bible; “Even the Bible touches on these subjects. Luke 14:31 says, ‘Or what king, going out to encounter another king in war, will not sit down first and deliberate whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him who comes against him with twenty thousand?’ I would rather be the second king with twenty thousand than the first with ten – and also have a clearer objective and a more decisive strategy (Powell 207).” While he leaves this recognition implicit, referencing the Bible as an authoritative source says a lot about who he is as a person and how he sees religion operating within his own life as well as the lives of his readership. In

this case, he was directly critiquing the decision-making processes behind the Afghanistan and Iraq invasions. Given that the Bush administration was well-known for bringing religious justification into their rallying cry for war, perhaps Powell wanted to incorporate a religious justification against jumping right into a conflict without developing proper strategy first. When Powell chose to reference his time as Secretary of State throughout this memoir, it was often done in a way that critiqued decisions made by the administration. This context of internal conflict is important to consider when reading Powell's work.

In another retrospective section on the nature of war in general, Powell brings religion up as an important consideration for occupying forces. He writes, "A defeated country under occupation is not a neat and orderly place. …There may be riots, looting, or widespread hostility to the occupiers, even sabotage and assassinations. Religious, political, or ethnic rivalries, kept under a lid before the invasion, may erupt unpredictably in the invasion's aftermath (Powell 210)." While this section was not explicitly written about the wars during his term as Secretary of State, his criticisms of how the Iraq War was handled while he was in office are not a secret. In 2012, when this book was published, he had seven years to reflect and contextually digest all that had happened since his time in office. Much of what he writes is just as much informed by the time during which he writes as much as it is informed by the time about which he writes. However, keeping these considerations in mind, Powell still takes the time to mention religious rivalries as an explicit consequence of war. He doesn't do much to unpack what a "religious" rivalry might look like, but he does recognize that religion is an important factor to consider in these contexts albeit within a longer list with ethnicity and politics. Unlike Albright's emphasis on how religion should be considered as its own factor, Powell seems to keep it within the same confines as other factors and not distinct. Because Powell didn't elaborate on this subject, it is

difficult to determine what he actually believed, but these subtle distinctions are still worth noting.

### *Implicit Assumptions*

While Colin Powell's memoir served different purposes than the other memoirs within this research project, his writing still included some commentary on the role of religion within U.S. diplomacy. Religion and religious influences were often left implicit because Powell's focus was more on how to explain good leadership and less on an in-depth analysis of U.S. decision-making in foreign affairs. Religion – or more specifically Episcopal Christianity – also played a role in his personal life as evidenced by his church-related anecdotes and biblical citations. While it's difficult to ascertain exactly how much influence religion may have had on his upbringing, especially when he only writes about it briefly, this trend of religious influence continues throughout each memoir within this project. U.S. secretaries of state, just like anyone raised in a religious environment, are impacted and influenced by those early-instilled values. For him and the other Secretaries in this project, religion was implicated cited as a source of moral and ethical formation, as well as a base for personal belief. These early instilled values were far more ambiguous in practice, however, and how they actually influenced certain policy decisions is just as difficult for me to measure as it most likely is for the Secretaries to fully unpack themselves.

## ***Condoleezza Rice***

Condoleezza Rice published *No Higher Honor* in 2011, two years after the end of her term as Secretary of State under President George Bush. Prior to her appointment as Secretary of State, Rice served as National Security Advisor and had a long and successful career in

Washington. Rice was the first female African-American to hold the Secretary of State position and she served under President Bush's second-term from 2005 to 2009. In this memoir, Rice details her time in Washington by reflecting on and responding to both the highlights and lowlights of her career. Much of the book, like the other Secretaries of States' memoirs written at this time, is devoted to untangling the complex U.S. involvement in the Middle-East. Her memoir spends a lot of time outlining the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Bush administration's attempts to alleviate violence there while also navigating the beginnings of the Iraq War. Aligning with Hurd's assessment of international affairs, religion and religious references are embedded throughout the text. Ultimately, I found that religion was relevant to Rice on a personal level especially when writing about Israel and Palestine yet her tone shifted when she evaluated how religion operated on a political level there. Religion was also relevant as a tool on a diplomatic level for Rice when she was interacting with other world leaders, particularly spiritual world leaders.

### *Personal vs. Political Religion & The Holy Land*

Throughout the memoir, Rice incorporates how religion is important to her on a personal level. Unsurprisingly, given her conservative Christian identity, when Rice introduces her diplomatic experience with Israel, she used a personal anecdote outlining her own religious connection to the land. She wrote, "…I took my first trip to the Holy Land in July of that year. For me it was literally a religious experience, visiting the Sea of Galilee and the Mount of the Beatitudes and walking where Christ had walked. But since it was well known by that time that I was advising George W. Bush, the visit took on a distinctly political character (Rice 50)." While I think Rice wants to express her personal religious connection to this place, she only briefly mentions it throughout this early chapter of the book and more often than not she details

religious things as separate from the political – even in the case of holy places. For example, just a few pages later, while outlining the political significance of Ariel Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount in 2000 by detailing some of the religious history associated with it she wrote, "As I had walked through Jerusalem [the summer before], I reflected that the world's greatest religions don't come together in the Holy City; they clash there, with Israeli soldiers securing the Dome of the Rock on top of the Temple Mount near the wailing wall – the Dome of the Rock having been built in a way to demonstrate dominion over the whole of the Old City – and various Christian sects squabbling about space in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. I found Jerusalem enchanting but disturbing, a place where man's desire to use God for dominance over other human beings was very much on display (Rice 53)." Here, Rice makes strong, but brief, criticisms of the political leverage that can come with religious authority. This assessment of religion is far less careful than any other claim she made in the text. However, it was embedded within a chapter devoted to political affairs in the Middle-East and had I not been reading closely I may have missed it.

Despite these strong claims, the very next line seems to undermine the accusation she had just made. It reads, "In any case, Yasar Arafat, perhaps to cover his failings at Camp David, used Sharon's visit to the Temple Mount as a pretext and essentially condoned a return to the violence that the Palestinians had renounced in the Oslo Accords (Rice 53)." She then goes on to detail the second intifada and subsequent violence that prevented any meaningful peacebuilding for some time after those events. While it feels like Rice wants to make some eloquent assessment of religion in connection with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, she is somewhat reserved in how far she will take it. Perhaps Rice sees religion as a mere pretext for political unrest, but to say so outright would be to deny certain truths tied up in religious identity. True to diplomatic

statecraft, it feels like she doesn't want to make a statement – even in her memoir – that could indicate an alternative opinion than one the U.S. had officially adopted. While these two examples of how Rice saw religion within her life and within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict were from much earlier in her career, this goes to show how interconnected personal religious beliefs and opinions can be within U.S. foreign affairs.

### *Pragmatic Value of Religious Knowledge*

An additional instance where religion is invoked within Rice's memoir are during times of interacting with world leaders, including President Bush himself during her time as Secretary of State. In a tense moment with Saudi Arabia regarding a diplomatic disagreement about Israel, President Bush utilized religion to help smooth things over. Rice wrote, "The President, temporizing a bit, asked the Saudi leader to go for a tour of the ranch and talk about religion. As President Bush has written in his own memoir, the atmosphere improved while they were riding together in his pickup truck. He and the Saudi encountered a wild turkey that Abdullah took as a sign from God and a bond of friendship between the two men. When the President related the incident that evening at dinner, I thought, 'Whatever works' (Rice 141)." In this instance, religion was used a bridge to build a connection during an otherwise complicated moment. However, Rice's quick dismissal of the potential religious validity that could be at play here shows that she doesn't necessarily find it convincing. I think Rice sees religion as something that can be meaningful in private but as a purely a pragmatic tool within the public sphere.

Within this same chapter, Rice details an instance of diplomatic interaction with a religious world leader as well – the Vatican. Rice's term as Secretary fell during a time of intense violence and unrest within Israel. There were frequent raids on Palestinian towns in response to equally as frequent terrorist attacks. In one tense moment, Rice received a phone call from the

Vatican itself when Israeli forces – presumably condoned by the U.S. – had damaged a holy site in Bethlehem. Rice details, "When the Israelis entered Bethlehem, dozens of fleeing militants broke into the Church of the Nativity, seeking refuge. The church…was damaged by errant Israeli gunfire during the ensuing siege. That prompted an angry phone call to me from the Vatican's secretary of state. He didn't mince words. Saying that the Holy Father himself had directed him to make the phone call, the cardinal called the incident an attack on one of the holiest shrines for Christians (Rice 137-38)." Rice then detailed how she attempted to diplomatically resolve the issue by noting that the incident had in fact been an accident. Interacting with spiritual leaders, like the Vatican in this example, shows how having a baseline understanding of religion might be a useful tool. Rice's inclusion of this story also shows the complexity of religion in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and how quickly one seemingly small action could make international waves.

### *Superficial Conclusions*

Throughout her memoir, Rice deals with religion in a very superficial way. Even when discussing the many attempts to better relations between Israel and Palestine, Rice didn't give much credence or authority to religion as a dominating factor within international relations overall. She was also dealing with the Iraq War during her term and it isn't so far of a stretch to claim that the Israeli-Palestinian issue fell by the wayside during this time. While Rice seems to want to talk about her own religious upbringing and background, especially in the introduction of her interactions with Israel, she quickly turned back to the political issues at play time and time again throughout her memoir. Like Powell, Rice includes religion in a long list of factors at play during any particular issue and a lot goes unsaid in her assumptions about the role religion might play. Trying to apply this to Hurd's theory is difficult because Rice doesn't really seem to be

taking religion seriously in the first place, let alone taking religion so seriously that there are blind-spots. Religion is certainly at play, but Rice doesn't highlight it or spend much time trying to unpack anything beyond a superficial understanding.

### *Hillary Clinton*

Just a year after the conclusion of her term as Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton published *Hard Choices* in 2014. In this memoir, she details various decisions she made and issues she dealt with as Secretary of State from 2009 to 2013 under President Obama's first term. Reflecting back on her time as First Lady, Senator of New York, and as a U.S. Presidential candidate to give context, Clinton constructs a personal analysis of her version of diplomacy and highlights the crucial "hard choices" that she and her staff faced during this specific time period. A large portion of the memoir is devoted to the Middle-East due to its significance during this time period. She also writes extensively on the tragedy that occurred in Benghazi for which she has since been heavily criticized. Throughout the text, religion is identified as a key factor and sometimes a catalyst during times of international crisis, religion shapes Clinton's own worldview and personal ties to diplomacy, and it serves as a point of reference for understanding another culture.

#### *Religious Narrative in Israel & Palestine*

Contained within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict portion of this memoir, Clinton sought to create a personal religious connection through describing her spiritual upbringing as she wrote about this part of the world. In "The Middle-East: The Rocky Path of Peace" chapter (Clinton 301-330), Clinton writes specifically on the Israeli-Palestinian crisis. She opens this section with a recounting of her first visit to Israel: "I visited Israel for the first time in December 1981 on a

church trip to the Holy Land with Bill. …We prayed at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre…We also paid our respects at some of the holiest sites for Christians, Jews, and Muslims, including the Western Wall, the Al-Aqsa Mosque, and the Dome of the Rock. I loved Jerusalem…. When we left the city and visited Jericho, I got my first glimpse of life under occupation for Palestinians… Bill and I both came home from that trip feeling a strong personal bond to the Holy Land and its peoples. (Clinton 302-303)" This anecdote describing her own personal religious ties to the land, and not a retelling of diplomatic or political events, was one of the only instances where she referred to this region as "the Holy Land". I'm not exactly sure what to make of this vocabulary choice, but I do think it's significant in understanding Clinton's own mentality when thinking about Israel and Palestine from a personal perspective versus from a diplomatic one. Perhaps it was an unintentional distinction, but even small details can reveal a lot about implicit understandings and conceptualizations of religion.

Clinton's conceptualizations of religion are also present as she further describes Israeli-Palestinian affairs outside of her own personal understandings. In tune with the establishment line, Clinton repeats the American commitment to maintaining Israel's future as a Jewish state, however, she also analyzes why that commitment is complicated. In analyzing Israel's wish to be democratic and Jewish, she outlines how rising birthrates among Palestinians contribute to what she sees as the necessary implementation of the Two-State Solution: "As long as Israel insisted on holding on to the territories, it would become increasingly difficult and eventually impossible to maintain its status as both a democracy and a Jewish majority state. Sooner or later, Israelis would have to choose one or the other or let the Palestinians have a state of their own. (Clinton 312)" In her negotiations with leadership from both sides, Clinton writes about how religion interacts with diplomatic work: "Bibi invoked the biblical story of Isaac (father of the Jews) and

Ishmael (father of the Arabs), the two sons of Abraham, who despite their differences, came together to bury their father. 'I can only pray…that the pain we have experienced…will unite and forge a durable and lasting peace for generations.' (Clinton 324)" Clinton's summary of this meeting shows how religious references and understandings can shape the narrative surrounding peace unique to "the Holy Land," in this instance.

### *Religion & Benghazi*

While religion might be expected in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, I also found it was just as relevant in Clinton's account of the Benghazi crisis. Due to her upcoming Presidential run and the huge controversy surrounding how her administration handled this particular issue, Clinton spends a lot of time working to untangle and demystify the complicated nature of what happened in Benghazi (Clinton 382-415). Perhaps due to my own lack of knowledge on this particular international crisis, I discovered through Clinton's memoir that religion was truly at the center of this tragedy. In an explanation covering the factors that led to this tragedy, Clinton pointed to the release of an inflammatory, derogatory, and plainly Islamophobic video released on September 8th 2012 – just four days prior to the attacks on the diplomatic outpost – as sparking protests and outrage among Muslim communities throughout the region (Clinton 386). Purportedly the trailer for a full-length movie titled "Innocence of Muslims," this fourteen-minute English-language and Arabic-subtitled video depicts the prophet Muhammad and, by association, all Muslims as violent, child-molesting criminals. The whole video was a poorly edited and poorly acted reconstruction of ancient times through a grossly derogatory and Islamophobic perspective[16].

[16] For several years, the video was not available on YouTube after being flagged as hate-speech. However, I did manage to find an updated link to the video embedded in an online magazine article from 2012. This Intelligencer article by Joe Coscarelli discusses the amateurish nature of the video clip and the problems that the video sparked within Libya and Egypt. (Coscarelli)

While it didn't receive much press in the U.S. or was simply dismissed as nonsense, many Muslims in the rest of the world took this video as a personal attack. Clinton even notes, "This was not the first time that provocateurs had used offensive material to whip up popular outrage across the Muslim world, often with deadly results. In 2010, a Florida pastor named Terry Jones announced plans to burn the Quran…His threats were picked up and amplified by extremists setting off widespread protests. At that time, I was surprised that one firebrand in Gainesville, Florida with a tiny church could cause so much trouble." In this case, the reaction resulted in the loss of seven lives at a U.N. office. Clinton went on to write, "Deadly protests erupted again in February 2012 after U.S. troops inadvertently burned religious texts …in Afghanistan. Four Americans died. Now Jones was helping promote this new video insulting the Prophet Muhammad and there was a real danger of history repeating itself." (Clinton 386-387). She then goes on to further depict the specifics within Benghazi, but I think this initial analysis of hers truly sheds light on the ways that cross-cultural religious clashing and hatred can have an incredibly serious impact on U.S. foreign affairs. Her inclusion of this analysis also shows that U.S. leadership was highly aware of how powerful these forces can be – at least in hindsight.

### *Surface Level Religious Freedom*

Religious freedom was also a major part of Clinton's memoir. Contained within a chapter about human rights, Clinton wrote, "I also urged the Council to move beyond a decade-long debate over whether insults to religion should be banned or criminalized. It is time to overcome the false divide that pits religious sensitives against freedom of expression and pursue a new approach based on concrete steps to fight intolerance wherever it occurs. (Clinton 574)" There is certainly a line where freedom of expression merges with hate speech against certain religions, Islam in particular, and to not define that boundary in an attempt to end a contentious debate felt

like a very superficial attempt at moving past problematic issues at best. Clinton went on to write about how "real democracy" can only be established when people are free to practice whatever religion they like outside of the constraints of oppressive ideology (Clinton 575). Still not exactly explaining how to solve the conflict between freedom of expression and religious freedom, it was clear that Clinton believed that with careful consideration the two could harmoniously exist within democratic states. Perhaps a bit overly optimistic given the complex nature of these issues, her specific inclusion of "religious freedom" didn't do anything more than reiterate vague U.S. stances on the issue.

### *Emerging Themes*

Within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in particular, Clinton again falls in line with other secretaries in this project; She ties her religious identity into why she holds solving this conflict with such high regard. This isn't done in a particularly explicit way and I'm not even sure she recognizes this own association within herself, but given the inclusion of how the first time she visited "the Holy Land" was through a church trip and her reference to this place as "the Holy Land" itself, there is a connection. With regards to how Clinton maps religious interactions with international diplomacy, both through the Benghazi crisis and through discussions of religious freedom as a whole, it is clear that both she and her administration were aware of religion's power in the world. Personal religious values and the larger political framework – both domestically and internationally – are often not explicitly connected in these ways, but these memoirs have made it clear that implicit connections exist and are important.

Clinton's memoir reveals much about the conceptualizations of religion within a very establishment-driven administration. This approach is can certainly be criticized by Hurd's theory and the superficiality of Clinton's descriptions reveal her reservations about making too

many waves with this memoir. For Hurd, religious freedom needs to make room for the inherent "messiness" of religion within government and legal frameworks. Clinton's seemingly superficial analysis of how religious freedom tied into democracy and human rights didn't exactly accomplish this task. Favoring the idea that religious freedom could peaceably coexist with freedoms of expression is blind in some ways to certain complexities. This idea doesn't quite grasp how serious a misrepresentation of the Prophet Muhammed is within Islam, for example. I don't think that this comes from a malicious place but I do think that the frameworks of U.S. foreign affairs don't leave a lot of room to fully understand religion in ways that extend beyond what might be practical knowledge for solving any particular issue. Clinton's superficial and establishment-based approach to religion reflects her drive to not harm her future Presidential chances with this work, but her short-comings on the religious front stand stark in comparison with the work of other Democrat secretaries, like Albright and Kerry, on these same matters.

***John Kerry***

In 2018, John Kerry published *Every Day Is Extra*, a memoir reflecting on the most impactful moments of his life from childhood, to soldier in Vietnam, to Washington politician, to Secretary of State. Kerry served as the 68th Secretary of State under President Obama's second-term from 2013 to 2017. Kerry remains dutifully diplomatic and reserved in his reflections while adopting some criticism about certain parts of his life. Approximately half of the book is devoted to his time as Secretary of State which details the difficult decisions, hard-fought agreements, and complex negotiations in which he took part. Kerry's Catholic identity played a major role in his life – his time as Secretary of State included. Unlike leaders who may attempt to downplay

their religious values and beliefs or merely leave them as implicitly understood, Kerry very much recognizes that his religious ties influence and inspire his political and diplomatic work. Additionally, he sees religion as a powerful force that shapes leadership and decision-making around the world[17]. When it comes to the Middle-East, Israel and Palestine especially, Kerry sees religious ties to land as something that makes an already complex conflict even more difficult to navigate. Religious influence within the Middle-East more broadly also created complex dynamics between states and non-state actors during his term. Kerry's intense recognition of how religion shaped his own life, the lives of others, and the relationships held between international actors drives this memoir as he reflects back on his time in public service.

### *Catholic Identity*

Kerry outlined his personal religious upbringing, values, and beliefs throughout the first half of his memoir. In recounting his time in Vietnam, he consistently noted reliance on his Catholic faith as something that guided his actions and gave him strength during difficult times (Kerry 42-110). His religious ties also stuck with him throughout his time as a politician in Washington. While serving in the senate from 1985 to 2013, Kerry noted the importance of weekly prayer breakfasts which he saw as something that united Christians across the aisle in setting time aside for spiritual reflection (Kerry 168). He wrote that during the 80s and 90s, "[The Senate Prayer Breakfast] was focused on scripture and charged senators with exploring the Bible itself to find meaning. … Each week we would hear from senators or former senators, usually describing how a relationship with God helped them navigate the trials life had thrown their way" (Kerry 169). For Kerry, religion, or perhaps more specifically Christian faith, was a unifying force within the Senate. In this particular section of his book, little was written

[17] This viewpoint was also backed up by the expansion of the Office of Religion and Global Affairs within Secretary Kerry's State Department. Unfortunately, this office was disbanded by Secretary Rex Tillerson in 2017. (Casey)

regarding potential conflicts between church and state but he did address these issues later in his memoir. Kerry didn't see religion as something that could be separated from politics, at least on a personal level. Just as Albright had noted about a religious leader's innate inability to separate their faith from their politics (Albright 285), Kerry too recognized this interwoven relationship.

Kerry also spoke about his personal religious views in relationship with party lines and the Catholic Church's stance on particular issues. He discussed at-length how he reconciled his political stances on controversial issues from the viewpoint of the Catholic Church. He noted that in an election year, the Church published a "voting guide for the faithful" (Kerry 294) which he didn't always agree with, especially during his presidential campaign. Recognizing the challenges this posed to both his identity as a Catholic and his profound sense of obligation as a senator and potentially a future president, he wrote, "I know my position on a few of these issues differed from that of the Church. … Fellow Catholic senators also grappled with these issues to try and reconcile their views about life and the articles of our faith with the fact that we didn't just represent our fellow Catholics. … While I am allowed in public life to have personal beliefs as a matter of faith, and I can advocate for them, I can't impose an article of faith on someone who doesn't believe what I do, who doesn't share a similar article of faith. (Kerry 295)" Kerry discussed and addressed these issues carefully due to the sense of cognitive dissonance that this internal conflict created. He also wrote, "If you truly have faith and your faith informs your life, it is hard to reconcile separate worlds of political ideology and religious theology. … So, as the Senate's chaplain Barry Black likes to say, you can 'separate church from state, but not faith from state.' The question is how you judge what acts make faith real. (Kerry 296-297)" Perhaps a lifelong struggle for Kerry, he very much recognized that religion and government were always intertwined despite the best efforts of those who honored the constitution. He also seemed to be

able to take the understandings he had about his own faith into his later role as secretary of state when dealing with religions different from his own.

### *Faith in the Peace Process*

Moving into his time as Secretary, I found that not unlike other former secretaries of state, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was a main focal point during Kerry's time in office at the State Department. Roughly forty pages of Kerry's memoir are exclusively devoted to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Kerry 440-484). He recognized that this conflict had "eluded presidents, prime ministers, international mediators and, yes, secretaries of state" (Kerry 440). Nevertheless, he wanted to take on this conflict given the importance of establishing peace in the Middle-East for American interests but also out of a sense of moral obligation. He wrote, "I set out on this journey with a very personal commitment to Israel. … As a boy, I sang the anthem 'O Pray for the Peace of Jerusalem' in the chapel at St. Paul's School. I knew Israel as the homeland for the Jewish people – a land of milk and honey" (Kerry 444-445). He then detailed a few of his past trips to the region, both religious in nature as well as a few trips he took during his time as a senator. Kerry seemed to recognize that the political realm often overlapped into the religious as he navigated through the retelling of his attempt to make peace.

When it came to settlements within land previously designated as Palestinian, Kerry's stance was identical to that of previous administrations. He noted the Obama administration's full respect for Israel's profound historic and religious ties to the land but he also recognized that religious connection didn't necessarily trump the realities of life on the ground (Kerry 481). Kerry noted that religious justifications were often used in the creation of new settlements, for example, despite the political effects that their creation often sparked (Kerry 480). Noting the importance of sacred spaces, he wrote, "The Temple Mount/Haram al-Sharif is important to

people of all three monotheistic faiths – Jews, Muslims, and Christians. Of all these issues of incitement, this was the one that could trigger a holy war throughout the region" (Kerry 475). While this was written in passing, I think this fear of inciting yet another war in the Middle-East – and especially creating some sort of apocalyptic holy war – is a very real factor when considering the reasons for wanting to solve this conflict. Ultimately, however, Kerry's efforts were hardly more fruitful than any previous attempts had been. Despite this, he remains hopeful at the end of this chapter; "For the sake of future generations of Israelis and Palestinians, for all the people of the region, of the United States and around the world who have prayed for and worked for peace for generations, let's hope that the Israelis and the Palestinians are prepared to make those [difficult] choices before it's too late. As for me, my mind returns to the anthem I learned in the chapel in high school: 'O Pray for the Peace of Jerusalem.' It is a song worth singing, and despite the scars I have, when it came to the effort to make peace between two peoples who desperately deserve it, I will always be proud that I got caught trying" (Kerry 483-484).

### *Consequences of Extremism*

While the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was undoubtedly incredibly important to Kerry, he also faced the growing threats of ISIS/ISIL/Daesh[18] during his time as secretary. In the fight against this new type of terrorism, Kerry wrote about the difficulties and challenges he faced when navigating the complexity of religious obligation, political fears, and hesitation to launch the U.S. into yet another war in the Middle-East. He wrote, "Support from the Gulf was hardly automatic. Persuading Sunni leaders to commit their military and their voices to a war against

[18] What exactly to call this group comes with many political and cultural considerations. These are explained by Faisal Irshaid in his BBC article titled, "ISIS, ISIL, IS, or Daesh? One Group, Many Names" (Irshaid). In order to cover all bases, I chose to incorporate three of the main names utilized by news media and politicians alike.

Sunni extremists who were fighting their sworn enemies in Syria and fighting for a return to Sunni dominance in Iraq was not without its own complications" (Kerry 546). For Kerry, religion, as it pertained to ethnic and political division, was at the forefront of fighting ISIS. He was very clear to mention the distinctions between Islam as a whole, Sunni Islam, Shia Islam, and radical extremism. In reflecting on a conversation that he had with the former King of Saudi Arabia, Kerry wrote, "He expressed his concern that the forces of extremism presented a long-term threat to the very kingdom he would one day pass on to others in the House of Saud, and to Islam itself. In the background we could hear the soft music of prayers played always in the palace. He fingered prayer beads in his hand." (Kerry 547). Religion was very much at play here and this was just one example. Throughout the memoir, Kerry was always careful to note where spirituality and religion might have been a factor. Perhaps it was Kerry's own religious commitments that led him to see religion in every detail of his diplomatic and political career or perhaps, as Kerry would claim, religion was truly that integral to navigating any aspect of international affairs – especially in the fight against radical extremism.

### *Dedication to Embedding Religion*

In this memoir, Kerry was always careful to detail his personal religious ties when he recognized that they were influencing his actions in any given role within public service and highlight where religion played into his diplomatic work. As was noted in the introduction of this project through Kerry's article, "We Ignore the Global Impact of Religion at Our Peril," Kerry was continually seeking to understand how faith and politics interact on both the domestic and international levels. This continual project was also echoed in his expansion of the Office of Religion and Global Affairs within the State Department[19]. His memoir further justified and

[19] To reiterate an earlier note, this office was formally disbanded under Secretary Tillerson in 2017. The issue has yet to be revisited under the current administration. (Cannon)

highlighted why he saw religion as something integral to international affairs in these ways. By connecting this to Hurd's work, I can see that there are differences in studying policy as evidence for how religion was shaping global politics versus narrative. Kerry's recognition of religion's role feels far more nuanced than the policy-based stances that Hurd was criticizing. He approached faith with a less black and white outlook on how it impacts the world and identifies many of his own experiences as evidence of this. While he was careful to maintain a statesman-like approach, Kerry's memoir details something that is perhaps closer to the outlook that Hurd wanted to see in international affairs.

**Themes Regarding Religion and Diplomacy**

By analyzing each of these memoirs and identifying instances where religion was at play, it becomes clear that each Secretary relied on their religious upbringing to some extent, felt that religion had some utility within international diplomacy, and felt that religious factors only complicated an already complex situation within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Additionally, a majority of these former secretaries dealt with religion in very superficial ways, not always taking their own religious views into full consideration or unpacking what they might mean within the context of their work. Their memoirs are all written in different styles and with different goals, but each of these books brought similar things to the table. Just as Sidonie Smith pointed to in her analysis of political memoirs, the element of bildungsroman is vital to the character of this genre (Smith). Surprisingly, or perhaps not surprisingly given the political power that can come with Christianity in the United States[20], each and every one of these

[20] McDougall engages with this idea in his article, "Religion in Diplomatic History." In short, there is a lot of power to be wielded by Christians in the domestic political world. This power can then seep into international affairs through the channels of how U.S. democracy and political appointments typically operate.

Secretaries incorporated religion into the bildungsroman aspects of their memoirs. For Albright, her Roman Catholic upbringing gave her strong moral guidelines and the discovery of her Jewish roots unlocked a family history that changed how she saw her place in the world (Albright 285). For Powell, his experiences in the Episcopalian church taught him life lessons and gave him moral guidelines as well (Powell 45). Rice shied away from overtly detailing her religious background but her small references were enough to determine that she too grounded her moral compass within Christianity (Rice 50). Much in the same vein as Rice, Clinton was careful to not associate herself too strongly with her spiritual background but even in her politically nuanced style, she clearly also felt her morality came from her Christian roots (Clinton 302). Kerry too felt this way, perhaps even more overtly than the other Secretaries. His Catholic identity was at the core of his political action and diplomatic work (Kerry 169). In these examples, religion functions as a positive but vague force for shaping moral values that doesn't focus on doctrinal specificities. If Hurd's "two faces of faith" model was to be applied here, religion is only conceptualized as valid when it can provide good moral value (Hurd 22). This conceptualization leaves out a lot of elements of religious belief and ultimately categorizes the outliers as belonging to "bad" religion in that they don't fit that ideal model. Perhaps this is reading to much into the implicit structures of these political memoirs, but the foundations behind U.S. foreign policy are very much echoed in these examples.

An additional thread found between all these memoirs is the idea that religion and religious literacy can be utilized as a tool within diplomatic work. This connection was more subtle than the religious integration into each bildungsroman, but each memoir incorporated some element of this thinking. Albright, especially due to the International Religious Freedom Act (United States Congress), was very clear along this line of thinking. For her, religious

freedom was not only something that needed to be protected, but also something that could be leveraged within diplomatic negotiation (Albright 285). Powell was far less transparent on this subject. Religion was something he lumped in with a laundry list of other factors to consider within the consequences of war, but the fact that he included it at all shows that he believed religion should be considered to some extent (Powell 210). Rice saw religion as a pragmatic tool within certain negotiations. In her story about President Bush and the Saudi Arabian leader, it was clear that the religious conversation Bush initiated and the subsequent sign interpreted by the Saudi to be from Allah, was only interesting to her insofar as it "worked" (Rice 141). Clinton also noted religion was pragmatic in certain situations. As she untangled the Benghazi crisis within her memoir, religion was an important element for her to understand and interpret in the days leading up to the crisis (Clinton 386). While she didn't go so far as to say this, perhaps quicker action taken against religiously intolerant propaganda could prevent certain international responses in the future. Kerry too viewed religion as a utility. This wasn't the only function of religion for him, but Kerry saw religion as inherently interwoven into all elements of international affairs, domestic politics, and individuals' lives. He claimed that understanding religion in this way would be practical for all people, especially those in the diplomatic field ("We Ignore…"). This connection found throughout each of these memoirs sheds some light on the conceptualization of religion within the U.S. State Department. While there are a number of factors to consider when interpreting and analyzing narrative in political memoirs, the fact that religion was even included shows that it is being taken seriously on some level. They don't seem to be particularly interested in the intricacies of religious doctrine or ritual but rather recognize that religion can be an aspect of identity or a pragmatic tool.

As I had suspected at the beginning of this project, religion seemed particularly present in the memoirs when they were discussing U.S. affairs in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict[21]. Albright noted that religious claims of divine rights to land stopped productive conversation and slowed down the peace process on more than one occasion (Albright 129). While she recognized the important history behind such claims, she saw religion as something that was often politicized in this part of the world. Politicization of religion within Israel and Palestine was something that Rice pointed to as well. While she was careful to not make too harsh of an accusation, Rice's understanding of religion in this region was that it had historically only led to conflict and turmoil despite the hope that religions would one day coexist here (Rice 53). Within Clinton's memoir there was an important distinction between when she was writing about Israeli and Palestinian issues from a political or diplomatic perspective, versus when she was writing about them from a personal one. In her personal reflections, she referred to this land as the "Holy Land," but in the more politically nuanced sections she never used these words (Clinton 302). Kerry saw religion in this conflict as something that furthered political and social divides. Growing encroachment on Palestinian land through Israeli settlements and ever-present threats against the religious sovereignty of holy places demonstrated to Kerry that politicization of religion was threatening enough for him to even reference the looming concept of a "holy war" (Kerry 475). In addition to the prevalence of religion within their own analyses of the conflict, each of these Secretaries also referenced their personal religious connections to this region as something that motivated them to be the one that might finally solve this conflict. Despite those desires, however, none of the secretaries were able to make a sustainable impact on this long-

[21] To note: Colin Powell's memoir didn't offer any discussion of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict at all. The reasons for this can be found within his section of this project, but as a recap: his memoir was written nearly a decade after his term as Secretary of State, the Iraq War took precedence during the course of his term, and his memoir was structured and themed in a way that didn't easily lend itself to in-depth analysis of international issues. I would assume that like the others, he would have probably had these same religious connections to Israel given his Episcopal faith.

lasting conflict. In some ways, their criticisms of the politicization of religion are coming from a place similar to Hurd's criticism of the "bad" face of faith concept (Hurd 23). In this conceptualization, politicized religion becomes something doctrinally specific, a barrier to peace, or an instigator of conflict. Unlike their personal beliefs that stand in as a generic source of moral teaching, religion in this sense and in these contexts gets categorized as something that can be criticized.

While religion is part of the discussion and is being considered by a majority of these secretaries as at least tangentially relevant to the diplomatic world, there is also an element of superficiality at play here. Albright and Kerry definitely deal with religion on a much deeper level than any of the others, but none of these memoirs fully unpack religious assumptions and opinions in way that does them justice. I think this is due in part to the controversial nature of religious belief itself. I would argue that most people believe religion isn't something you should talk about openly in order to avoid offending someone or revealing something personal that they might find debatable. In the diplomatic world, everything a Secretary of State says and does reflects on the entire country and at this level, diplomatic tact is taken to an even higher stage. Their hesitation to fully engage religion within these memoirs comes from wanting to maintain a certain sense of decorum. A more complex take on religion wouldn't necessarily be popular or make for dynamic content within a memoir. Perhaps the element of taking religion more seriously in a sustained and nuanced way within international diplomacy, as Kerry suggests, would be better found within actual policy or initiatives like Hurd analyzed, and not within memoirs. Regardless, the connecting themes found throughout each of the memoirs reflect a larger picture of religion's role and conceptualization within U.S. foreign affairs, at least through the Secretaries' own words and perspectives. As detailed in the "What Can Memoirs

Reveal About History" section of this project, political memoirs are inherently flawed historical documents. Despite this, their narration and personal insight – even if both are fairly superficial – still depict much about the innerworkings of the political world.

**Conclusion**

In reconsidering John Kerry's article, "We Ignore the Global Impact of Religion at Our Peril," in contrast with the religious elements I found in each of these memoirs, it becomes clear that his assessment about the need to pay attention to religion is an incredibly pressing issue. Over the last twenty years, religious studies theory has been slowly making its way into U.S. foreign affairs by way of religious freedom initiatives and increasing general religious literacy of diplomats and foreign service workers. Kerry, however, doesn't think enough is being done to fully consider the vast consequences that come with ignoring how important religion is on a global scale. By expanding the Office of Religion and Global Affairs, Kerry was working diligently to make sure that religion was being analyzed at the same level as political histories, cultural or ethnic traditions, and economic realities on the ground of individual countries and regions. While this initiative was pursued after Hurd had already released her book, I think she would say that even if this wasn't perfect, it was a step in the right direction as far as better incorporating religion into international affairs would be concerned. Kerry argues that religion needs to be taken seriously. Hurd argues that taking religion seriously must be done carefully. In these memoirs, I found that aside from Albright and Kerry, religion was rarely being taken seriously in the first place let alone to the extent that Hurd would find sufficient. While there was development over time and religion was at least latently a part of diplomacy at the Secretary of State level, personal beliefs were often left under-analyzed resulting in implicit assumptions

about particular international issues. Over the span of the 20-year period, progress was made in how religion was conceptualized but during times of war or moments when attention was devoted to other pressing issues, religion wasn't always represented as something that was given much focus within these memoirs. When it came to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, religion was recognized as being tied up in politics but none of the Secretaries really knew what to do with that reality aside from noting it and attempting to work around it. However, perhaps the recognition and acknowledgement that religion is even a factor is the first part of this larger process. Moving from treating religion as something static and vague into further analyzing religion as doctrinally specific, pluralistic, and inherently relevant in individuals' lives would surely open the door to a more robust comprehension.

Bringing a religious studies perspective to international affairs is the future of comprehensive conflict resolution. I'm not just saying this because I've devoted the last four years of my life to the study of these categories, but because I think Kerry was really on to something that has been building for decades, if not centuries. As these memoirs have revealed, leaders engage with religion in often superficial ways despite their best efforts. Outside of the realm of the U.S. Department of State, there are organizations and initiatives in place that do the work of engaging with this intersection. *The International Center for Religion and Diplomacy*, a congressionally-backed non-profit established in 1997, seeks to engage with religious organizations for peacebuilding purposes and attempt to solve religiously involved international conflicts. Teetering closely to Hurd's critique about the dangers of dichotomizing "good" versus "bad" religions, the *ICRD* works hard to avoid basic understandings of faith and instead approaches their work with an ear toward leading religious studies scholars. Top think tanks and scholarly organizations like *The Brookings Institution* and *The Berkley Center for Religion,*

*Peace, and World Affairs* regularly engage with religion as it pertains to international affairs[22]. Through publishing innovative articles and raising public consciousness on these issues, they hope to influence public policy and opinions on foreign affairs in meaningful ways. While these examples fall outside of the realm of the State Department, they go to show how religion is being taken seriously and carefully in wider political circles. If Secretaries of State were to be inspired by this work, a lot of good could result from a reconceptualization of religion.

While I expected to be engaging with these memoirs much in the same way that Hurd dealt with various international policies, I actually found that religion wasn't incorporated on more than just a superficial level within these secretaries' representations of international relations. As I introduced this thesis I made the argument that if world leaders want to solve international conflicts through diplomatic and not military means, then they need to have a more robust understanding of the real impact of their actions and background assumptions as they pertain to religious individuals, institutions, and governments in the wider world. Without this deeper understanding, a lot goes unsaid in regards to religion's impact on the world. The consequences of failing to recognize this impact spells out our peril, according to John Kerry. The results of dealing with religion superficially in the long-term will certainly leave gaping blind spots in the how the United States engages with religious actors, particularly in the case of religious extremists. These memoirs show inklings of recognizing this issue throughout and the thinking certainly progresses over time, but much more needs to be done to change conceptualizations of religion at the highest level. It is my hope that the work former Secretaries of State have done to incorporate religion into their diplomatic approaches points to the kind of

[22] A few examples being the article by Shaun Casey titled "How the State Department Has Sidelined Religion's Role in Diplomacy," Peter Mandaville's work titled "The Case for Engaging Religion in U.S. Diplomacy," and Walter McDougall's "Religion in Diplomatic History."

future that Hurd described, even if they weren't quite to that point yet during their own administrations. Hurd's theoretical critiques are still valid and important especially when the secretaries weren't engaging with their own beliefs in ways that might privilege certain faiths as they interact with the world. While Kerry's calls to first deal with religion more seriously and consider its implications on global affairs ring true, once that step is completed, Hurd's considerations on how to make sure that incorporation doesn't create blind spots must then be undertaken. Everyone could certainly benefit from taking a religious studies course, Secretaries of State and other high-level officials included. By looking at the trendlines that this thesis uncovered, it is clear that religion's role within international affairs is slowly evolving along with public perceptions about the function religion ought to have within the government. While this thesis has only brushed the surface of a very complex intersection, I hope that the conclusions of this project can lead to even more work to be done within the engagement of U.S. politics and religion.

## References

Albright, Madeleine. *The Mighty and the Almighty: Reflections on America, God, and World Affairs*. HarperCollins, 2006.

Alles, Gregory D. "Religion [Further Considerations]." *Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Lindsay Jones, 2nd edition, Volume 11, Macmillan Reference USA, 2005, pp. 7701-7706.

Asad, Talal. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. John Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Cannon, Mae Elise. “Rex Tillerson's State Department Is Scrapping Key Obama-Era Religious Programs.” *Community*, HuffPost, 29 August 2017, huffpost.com/entry/tillersons-state-department-no-longer-a-place-for_b_59a5a612e4b0d81379a81ba1?ncid=engmodushpmg00000006

Casey, Shaun. “How the State Department Has Sidelined Religion's Role in Diplomacy.” *Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs*, Georgetown University, 5 September 2017, berkleycenter.georgetown.edu/essays/how-the-state-department-has-sidelined-religion-s-role-in-diplomacy.

Cavanaugh, William T. *The Myth of Religious Violence: Secular Ideology and the Roots of Modern Conflict.* Oxford University Press, Oxford Scholarship Online, 1 September 2009, oxfordscholarship-com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195385045.001.0001/acprof-9780195385045.

Clinton, Hillary Rodham. *Hard Choices*. Simon & Schuster, 2015.

Coscarelli, Joe. “This Is the Absurd, Islamophobic Video That Sparked Violent Protests in Libya

and Egypt.” *Intelligencer*, New York Magazine, 12 September 2012, nymag.com/intelligencer/2012/09/innocence-of-muslims-terry-jones-video-sparked-protests-libya-egypt.html.

Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica. “Madeleine Albright.” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Encyclopedia Britannica Inc., 23 May 2019, britannica.com/biography/Madeleine-Albright.

Egerton, George. "Politics and Autobiography: Political Memoir as Polygenre." *Biography* 15, no. 3, 1992, pp. 221-42, jstor.org/stable/23539449.

Gelbwaser, Javier, et. al. “Coexistence in the Middle East Program.” *Rothberg International School*, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2020, overseas.huji.ac.il/academics/summer-and-short-term-programs/faculty-led/special-programs/cme/.

Henderson, Margaret. “The Feminine Mystique of Individualism is Powerful: Two American Feminist Memoirs in Postfeminist Times.” *a/b: Auto/Biography Studies*, Volume 23, Issue 2, Winter 2008, pp. 165-184, https://doi.org/10.1080/08989575.2008.10846777

Hummel, Daniel G. "Foreign Policy and Religion: U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Israel." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*, Oxford University Press, 26 March 2019, oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-988

Hurd, Elizabeth Shakman. *Beyond Religious Freedom: The New Global Politics of Religion*. Princeton University Press, 2015.

International Center for Religion and Diplomacy. “Mission & Vision.” *International Center for Religion and Diplomacy*, International Center for Religion and Diplomacy, 2020, icrd.org/who-we-are/mission-vision/.

Irshaid, Faisal. “ISIS, ISIL, IS, or Daesh? One Group, Many Names.” *BBC News*, British Broadcasting Corporation, 2 Dec. 2015, www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-27994277.

Johnston, Douglas, and Cynthia Sampson. *Religion: The Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. Oxford University Press, 1995.

Kerry, John. *Every Day Is Extra*. Simon & Schuster, 2019.

Kerry, John. “We Ignore the Global Impact of Religion at Our Peril.” *America Magazine*, 2 September 2015, americamagazine.org/issue/religion-and-diplomacy.

King, Winston L. "Religion [First Edition]." *Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Lindsay Jones, 2nd edition, Volume 11, Macmillan Reference USA, 2005, pp. 7692-7701.

Mandaville, Peter. “The Case for Engaging Religion in U.S. Diplomacy.” *Order from Chaos*, The Brookings Institution, 7 March 2017, brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2017/03/07/the-case-for-engaging-religion-in-u-s-diplomacy/.

McDougall, Walter A. “Religion in Diplomatic History.” *A Nation Must Think Before It Acts*, Foreign Policy Research Institute, 2 March 1998, fpri.org/article/1998/03/religion-in-diplomatic-history/.

National Geographic Society. “Diplomacy.” *Resource Library*, National Geographic, 9 Oct. 2012, nationalgeographic.org/encyclopedia/diplomacy/.

Powell, Colin. *It Worked for Me*. HarperCollins, 2012.

Rice, Condoleezza. *No Higher Honor: A Memoir of My Years in Washington*. Crown Publishers, 2011.

Smith, Sidonie. “America's Exhibit A: Hillary Rodham Clinton's *Living History* and the Genres

of Authenticity." *American Literary History*, Volume 24, Issue 3, Fall 2012, pp. 523-542, doi.org/10.1093/alh/ajs028

United States, Congress. "International Religious Freedom Act." Public Law 105-292. *United States Statutes at Large*, vol. 112, 1998, pp. 2787-2815, *U.S. Government Publishing Office*, congress.gov/105/plaws/publ292/PLAW-105publ292.pdf

United States, Department of State. "Creation of Israel, 1948." *U.S. Department of State: Milestones in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations*, U.S. Department of State, 2016, history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/creation-israel.

United States, Department of State. "International Religious Freedom Act Fact Sheet." *U.S. Department of State: Office of International Religious Freedom Archive*, U.S. Department of State, 17 August 2011, 2009-2017.state.gov/j/drl/rls/fs/2011/170635.htm.

United States, Department of State. "The Oslo Accords." *U.S. Department of State Archive*, U.S. Department of State, 2009, 2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ho/time/pcw/97181.htm.